17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	
8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	
10	ROBIN HOLLINS and LOLA HOLLINS, No. C 16-06740 WHA
11	Plaintiffs,
12	v.
13	CORDIS CORPORATION and ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
14	CONFLUENT MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
15	Defendants.
16	/

The parties previously informed the Court that defendant Cordis Corporation removed this action, "along with other cases asserting the claims of more than 200 plaintiffs, under the 'mass action' provision of the Class Action Fairness Act"; that Judge Edward Chen had issued an order remanding many such cases; that Cordis had appealed that order; and that "[t]he same jurisdictional issues raised in this appeal are at issue in the above-captioned matter" (Dkt. No. 15 at 2–3). Cordis recently filed notice that our court of appeals affirmed Judge Chen's order on April 14 and Cordis petitioned for rehearing en banc on April 28 (Dkt. No. 19).

By JUNE 1 AT NOON, Cordis shall SHOW CAUSE in writing why this action should not be remanded for the same reasons set forth in Judge Chen's order affirmed by our court of appeals.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 5, 2017.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE